

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed March 17, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiners

Examiner Recek and Examiner Caldwell are thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on June 2, 2009. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. No agreements were reached.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-36, 40-46, and 49-60 are currently pending. Of these pending claims, claims 4, 5, 7-10, 13, 17, 34, 35, 40-42, 45, and 46 are original claims; claims 33, 36 43, 44, and 49 have been currently amended without introduction of new matter; claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 12, 14-16, 19-32, and 50-56 have been previously presented; claims 2, 18, 37-39, 47, and 48 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer; and claims 57-60 are new claims that are submitted without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

The subject matter of the current claim amendments and the new claims has been described in various portions of Applicants' original specification, for example, in paragraphs [0145], and [0148] through [0151].

Indication of Allowability

Applicants wish to express their sincere gratitude towards Examiner for indicating that claims 1, 3-17, and 19-32 are allowable.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 33-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Masumoto, Parsons Jr., Acharya and in further view of Saloniadis et al. US 2003/0096576 A1.

Response to the Rejection

Claim 33

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103 for various reasons. For example, attention is drawn to page 6 of the Office action wherein it is asserted that it *“would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zhang by incorporating the public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation.”* Applicants respectfully point out that claim 33 is a device claim and as such, a proper rejection requires identification of prior art device elements that teach or anticipate the various device elements recited in the claim. Consequently, while it may indeed be reasonable to incorporate *“public/private data distinction as taught by Masumoto for the purpose of giving a more effective presentation,”* a proper rejection should disclose where in Masumoto (or elsewhere) can be found a *“user interface mechanism”* that is part of a server device, more so one as specifically recited in Applicants’ claim 33. As can be appreciated, a *“public/private data distinction”* can be implemented in various ways. For example, a processor can perform this function as part of a background process without providing any visibility or control of this process to a user (via a user interface).

Notwithstanding the remarks above, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 33 in an effort to obtain early allowance of claim 33 along with the other pending/allowed claims.

As amended, the claim now recites that the user interface mechanism is *“configured to provide an option for: a) disabling transmission of the private content to the at least one client device, or b) enabling transmission of the private content and the public content to the at least one client display device.”* This user interface mechanism, which is a part of a server computing device, enables the **server** device to provide to a user of the user interface mechanism the option to decide if the user wishes to transmit to a client display device, either just the public portion or

both the public and the private portions of the content.

In contrast, the cited art of Masumoto discloses a PC (assuming *arguendo* that this PC is a server device) that always transmits both the public and private portions to a client device (display device). The display device then uses a “*designated data deletion unit 205*” to remove the private portion (“*designated data*”) and display only the public portion. In other words, Masumoto’s PC (server) does not provide to a user, an option to selectively transmit to the client display device, just the public portion without the private portion being included.

To elaborate upon the deletion capability of Masumoto’s projector (i.e. the client device), attention is drawn to Masumoto’s Figs. 7 and 9 and the corresponding description. Specifically, col. 5, lines 64-66 teach: “*The designated data deletion unit 205 deletes parts corresponding to the designated data from the slide data analyzed by the file analysis unit 203.*” (deletion based on color, font etc.)

Incidentally, it may be pertinent to point out in the interests of explaining Masumoto’s invention in some further detail, that the *image expansion compression unit 206* contained in Masumoto’s projector 200 loops back the public + private portions to PC 100 for displaying both these portions in the PC. Towards this end, Masumoto col. 6, lines 59-67 teaches: “*On the other hand, the image expansion compression unit 206 expands the slide data before being deleted of the designated data by the designated data deletion unit 205 into image data and compresses the image data by using a compression format such as JPEG. The compressed data is transmitted to the PC 100 via the communication unit 201. The image data to be transmitted to the PC 100 is compressed because (a) a slight deterioration in image quality is acceptable as the image displayed by the display unit 102...*”).

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Masumoto nor the other cited art, individually and/or combinedly, teach or suggest various elements of the server device as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 33. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 33.

Claims 34-36 and 40-43

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 34-36 and 40-43 for various

reasons. For example, in rejecting Applicants' claim 43, the Office action justifies the rejection by asserting "*Masumoto teaches "hiding" the private content rather than not transferring it however the result is the same either way.*" Applicants respectfully point out that claim 43 is directed to "*a server computing device*" and not a method for transferring content. Hence a proper rejection should disclose where in the cited art can be found "*a transmitter component*" (device element) as recited in the claim rather than alluding to a functionality ("*hiding" the private content*") that can be implemented by a variety of devices, including a device other than a transmitter. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the current rejection of claim 43 is improper and must be withdrawn.

It will be further pertinent to point out that each of claims 34-36 and 40-43 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 33, which is allowable based on arguments presented above, thereby making claims 34-36 and 40-43 also allowable by law.

Consequently, in view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claims 37-39

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 37-39 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim 44

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103 for various reasons. However, in an effort to obtain early allowance of all pending claims, Applicants have opted to amend claim 44, which currently includes: "*means for disabling or enabling transmission of said private content to the at least one alternate display device while transmitting said public content to the at least one alternate display device.*"

Though the scope of claims 33 and 44 are different from one another, several remarks provided above in response to the rejection of claim 33 are equally pertinent to the rejection of claim 44 as well. However, in the interests of brevity these remarks will not be repeated herein. In short, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art, individually and/or combinedly, fails to teach or disclose various parts of Applicants' amended claim 44. Consequently, Applicants

request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 44.

Claims 45 and 46

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 45 and 46 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 44, which is allowable based on arguments presented above, thereby making claims 45 and 46 allowable by law. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claims 47 and 48

Applicants have opted to cancel claims 47 and 48 and respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim 49

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103 for various reasons. However, in an effort to obtain early allowance of all pending claims, Applicants have opted to amend claim 49, which currently includes: *“means for disabling or enabling transmission of said private content to the other computing devices while permitting transmission of said at least one public portion of the selected content to the other computing devices.”*

Though the scope of claims 33 and 49 is different from one another, several remarks provided above in response to the rejection of claim 33 are equally pertinent to the rejection of claim 49 as well. However, in the interests of brevity these remarks will not be repeated herein. In short, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art, individually and/or combinedly, fails to teach or disclose various parts of Applicants’ amended claim 49. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 49.

Claims 50-56

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-56 are allowable for several reasons. One among these several reasons arises from the fact that these claims are each dependent on claim 49, which is allowable based on arguments presented above, thereby making claims 50-56 allowable by law. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3501/300585.03
Application No.: 10/786,313
Office Action Dated: March 17, 2009

PATENT

followed by allowance of these claims.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3501/300585.03
Application No.: 10/786,313
Office Action Dated: March 17, 2009

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application is hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative.

Date: June 17, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439